UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/722,182	11/24/2003	Tad Dennis Brockway	MS1-1788US	7008
22801 LEE & HAYES	7590 04/07/200 SPLLC	EXAMINER		
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500			BOUTAH, ALINA A	
SPOKANE, WA 99201			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2143	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/722,182	BROCKWAY ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	ALINA N. BOUTAH	2143		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 Ma This action is FINAL . 2b)☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ access applicant may not request that any objection to the original page.	relection requirement. r. epted or b)□ objected to by the B			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	animon rioto ino attaonou emee	7.68.617.61.117.17.6.762.		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/17/08.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte		

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed March 17, 2008. Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 17, 2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dal Canto et al. (US 2003/0217166) in view of Snyder et al. (US 2004/0177073).

Regarding claim 1, Dal Canto teaches a method for presenting a merged view of remotely installed applications to which a user has terminal server (TS) based access, the method

comprising:

generating, by a client computing device, one or more shortcuts to one or more respective applications to which the user has TS based access (paragraph 0049, icons 440);

wherein each of the applications are installed at one or more installation points in an intranet, the client computing device being external to the intranet (figure 1; 0041, 0049); and

wherein the one or more shortcuts are aggregated to present a merged view of the applications (figure 2), the merged view being transparent of whether the applications are managed by different information sources across multiple accessor modules on the Intranet and configured for remote TS-based execution by different ones of multiple installation points (paragraph 51).

However, Dal Canto does not explicitly teach wherein the one or more shortcuts being independent files that point to the one or more respective applications to which the user has TS based access, the independent files being stored on the client computing device and presented to the user thru a user interface (UI) shell executing on the client computing device, and wherein an accessor interrogates a directory service of the internet for user specific resource data, wherein the user specific resource data includes data directed to obtaining the network address for a user's computing device via a domain name service (DNS).

However, this feature is known in the art of computing as evidenced by an analogous art.

Snyder teaches more shortcuts being independent files that point to the one or more respective

Page 4

applications to which the user has TS based access, the independent files being stored on the client computing device and presented to the user thru a user interface (UI) shell executing on the client computing device (see i.e. figures 12 and 13), and an accessor interrogates a directory service of the internet for user specific resource data, wherein the user specific resource data includes data directed to obtaining the network address for a user's computing device via a domain name service (DNS) [0070, 0244-0249]. At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the use of shortcuts in order to link specific file or directories, thus making file access easier and quicker. One of ordinary skill in the art would also enable the acdesssor to interrogate a directory service via a DNS because by definition, DNS serves as the "telephone book" for the internet by translating human-readable computer address into IP addresses, therefore it allows easy retrieval of specific resources quickly.

Regarding claim 2, Dal Canto teaches a method as recite in claim 1, wherein the one or more information sources comprise a directory service, a Systems Management Server, and/or a personal office computer associated with the user (paragraph 0009).

Regarding claim 3, Dal Canto teaches a method as recite in claim 1, wherein the one or more installation points comprise one or more servers and/or office computers associated with the user (paragraph 0009).

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 4, Dal Canto teaches a method as recite in claim 1, wherein the shortcuts

are presented in a desktop of the user (figure 2)

Regarding claim 5, Dal Canto teaches a method as recite in claim 1, wherein the shortcuts

are presented in an Internet browser window associated with a Web service providing remote

application discovery, the Web service being deployed on a Web server in the Intranet and

accessible by the client computing device over a public network (figure 2).

Claims 6-10 are similar to claims 1-5, respectively, therefore are rejected under the same

rationale.

Claims 11-15 are similar to claims 1-5, respectively, therefore are rejected under the

same rationale.

Claims 16-20 are similar to claims 1-5, respectively, therefore are rejected under the

same rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s)

of rejection.

Conclusion

It is noted that the column, line, and/or page number citations used in the prior art references as applied by the Examiner to the claimed invention are for the convenience of the Applicant to represent the relevant teachings of the prior art. The prior art references may contain further teachings and/or suggestions that may further distinguish the citations applied to the claims, therefore, the Applicant should consider the entirety of these prior art references during the process of responding to this Office Action. It is further noted that any alternative and non-preferred embodiments as taught and/or suggested within the prior art references also constitute prior art and the prior art references may be relied upon for all the teachings would have reasonably suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art. See MPEP 2123.

The prior art listed in the PT0-892 form included with this Office Action disclose methods, systems, and apparatus similar to those claimed and recited in the specification. The Examiner has cited these references to evidence the level and/or knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to provide support for universal facts and the technical reasoning for the rejections made in this Office Action including the Examiner's broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims as required by MPEP 2111 and to evidence the plain meaning of any terms not defined in the specification that are interpreted by the Examiner in accordance with MPEP 2111.01. The Applicant should consider these cited references when preparing a response to this Office Action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALINA N. BOUTAH whose telephone number is (571)272-3908. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (9:00 am - 5:00 pm).

Application/Control Number: 10/722,182 Page 7

Art Unit: 2143

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Alina N Boutah/ Examiner, Art Unit 2143